



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, DC 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/611,804	03/06/96	WOHLSTADTER	J 370068-6150

JACOB N WOHLSTADTER
CURTIS MORRIS & SAFFORD
530 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10036

HM21/0827

EXAMINER

ACHUTANURTHY, P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1648

DATE MAILED:

08/27/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/611,804

Applicant(s)
Wohlstadter et al

Examiner
P. Achutamurthy

Group Art Unit
1648



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 1, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire THREE month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 40, 41, 50-60, and 67-77 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-39, 42-49, 61-66, 78, and 79 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1818

DETAILED ACTION***Election/Restriction***

The election of Group I, claims 1-39, and 66 with traverse in paper No. 6 (response May 22, 1997) is acknowledged. In deference to applicants arguments, the restriction requirement has been reconsidered. Claims drawn to apparatus, system, cassette, article are now combined to be regarded as one single inventive concept, all claims being essentially drawn to apparatus embodiments. Accordingly Groups I, III, IV, VII, and VIII have been now treated to as group I and this is taken to be the elected Group. Accordingly claims 1-39, 42-49, 61-65, 66, 78, and 79 are examined on the merits. Claims 40, 41, 50-60, and 67-77 are withdrawn as being drawn to non-elected inventions. Applicants arguments traversing the restriction of these claims has ben fully considered but are not persuasive because these claims are drawn to multiple methods of use and biding domains which are distinct from the elected claims.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Art Unit: 1818

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Rejection B

Claims 1-32, 42-49, 61-66, 78, and 79 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 40-104 of copending Application No. 08/470,089. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: although drafted differently, the claims are drawn to apparatus embodiments comprising electrodes having binding domains on their surfaces, the apparatus being useful in electrochemiluminescence assays.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Art Unit: 1818

Rejection C

Claims 1-32, 42-49, 61-66, 78, and 79 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 40-153 of copending Application No. 08/470,484. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: although drafted differently, the claims are drawn to apparatus embodiments comprising electrodes having binding domains on their surfaces, the apparatus being useful in electrochemiluminescence assays.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Rejection D

Claims 1-32, 42-49, 61-66, 78, and 79 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 80 of copending Application No. 08/471,050. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

Art Unit: 1818

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: although drafted differently, the claims are drawn to apparatus embodiments comprising electrodes having binding domains on their surfaces, the apparatus being useful in electrochemiluminescence assays.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Response to Arguments

Applicants arguments have been found persuasive to obviate Rejection A. However, in view of the newly found copending application the double-patenting rejections have been issued.

The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to **Group Art Unit 1648**.

Serial Number: 08/611,804

Page 2

Art Unit: 1818

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to P. Achutamurthy whose telephone number is (703) 308-3804. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald E. Adams, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-0570. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

pa
14 August 1998


PONNATHAPURA ACHUTAMURTHY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800